



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/684,945

10/14/2003

Jeffrey P. Buschmann

03-1-529

3664

7590

11/25/2005

OSRAM SYLVANIA Inc.  
100 Endicott Street  
Danvers, MA 01923

EXAMINER

SEMBER, THOMAS M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2875

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HA

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/684,945	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUSCHMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thomas M. Sember	<b>Art Unit</b> 2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/05/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama ) in view of O'Connell et al. Regarding claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11, (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of the mechanical coupling coupled to the base end for electrical coupling of the electrical leads of the lamp capsule and mechanical support of the reflector lamp.

O'Connell et al (see figure 2) teaches a lamp capsule 12 and electrical and mechanical coupling coupled to the base end for electrical coupling of the electrical leads of the lamp capsule and mechanical support of the reflector lamp.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lamp of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) so as to include the lamp capsule and electrical coupling of O'Connell in order to provide an effectively efficient means for quickly disconnecting the light source to a lamp socket.

Regarding claim 2, the lens of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) is approximately hemispherical.

Regarding claim 4, the lens of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) is clear.

Regarding claim 5, the lens of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) is translucent (diffuse light).

Regarding claim 11, as broadly claimed the axial distance from the base end to the edge is approximately equal to a standard interior axial distance from a socket to a fixture opening, whereby the domed lens extends substantially beyond the fixture opening.

Regarding claims 6-7, ( Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) in view of O'Connell as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 discloses the claimed invention except for a plurality of facets on a lens in order to refract light. O'Connell et al teaches a lens with a plurality of facets. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lens of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) to include facets as taught by O'Connell et al in order to efficiently diffuse and refract light to the surroundings.

Regarding claim 8, (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) in view of O'Connell as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 discloses the claimed invention except for the reflector being parabolic in shape. O'Connell et al teaches a parabolic reflector 14. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reflector of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5) or Maruyama) to include a parabolic shape as taught by O'Connell et al in order to efficiently reflect light to the surroundings.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of O'Connell et al. Regarding claims 1-2, 4-5, 9 and 11, Kobayashi discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of the mechanical coupling coupled to the base end for electrical coupling of the electrical leads of the lamp capsule and mechanical support of the reflector lamp.

O'Connell et al (see figure 2) teaches a lamp capsule 12 and electrical and mechanical coupling coupled to the base end for electrical coupling of the electrical leads of the lamp capsule and mechanical support of the reflector lamp.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lamp of Kobayashi so as to include the lamp capsule and electrical coupling of O'Connell in order to provide an effectively efficient means for quickly disconnecting the light source to a lamp socket.

Regarding claim 2, the lens of Kobayashi is approximately hemispherical.

Regarding claim 4, the lens of Kobayashi is clear.

Regarding claim 5, the lens of Kobayashi is translucent (diffuse light).

Regarding claim 9, the reflector of Kobayashi is elliptical.

Regarding claim 11, as broadly claimed the axial distance from the base end to the edge is approximately equal to a standard interior axial distance from a socket to a fixture opening, whereby the domed lens extends substantially beyond the fixture opening.

Regarding claims 6-7, Kobayashi in view of O'Connell as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5, 9 and 11 discloses the claimed invention except for a plurality of facets on a lens in order to refract light. O'Connell et al teaches a lens with a plurality of facets. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lens of Kobayashi to include facets as taught by O'Connell et al in order to efficiently diffuse and refract light to the surroundings.

Regarding claim 8, Kobayashi in view of O'Connell as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 discloses the claimed invention except for the reflector being parabolic in shape. O'Connell et al teaches a parabolic reflector 14. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reflector of Kobayashi to include a parabolic shape as taught by O'Connell et al in order to efficiently reflect light to the surroundings.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2875

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al in view of O'Connell et al. Regarding claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11, Gardner al (particularly figure 5), discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of the mechanical coupling coupled to the base end for electrical coupling of the electrical leads of the lamp capsule and mechanical support of the reflector lamp.

O'Connell et al (see figure 2) teaches a lamp capsule 12 and electrical and mechanical coupling coupled to the base end for electrical coupling of the electrical leads of the lamp capsule and mechanical support of the reflector lamp.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lamp of Gardner al (particularly figure 5) so as to include the lamp capsule and electrical coupling of O'Connell in order to provide an effectively efficient means for quickly disconnecting the light source to a lamp socket.

Regarding claim 2, the lens of Gardner al (particularly figure 5) is approximately hemispherical.

Regarding claim 4, the lens of Gardner al (particularly figure 5) is clear.

Regarding claim 5, the lens of Gardner al (particularly figure 5) is translucent (diffuse light).

Regarding claim 8, the reflector of Gardner al is parabolic.

Regarding claim 11, as broadly claimed the axial distance from the base end to the edge is approximately equal to a standard interior axial distance from a socket to a

Art Unit: 2875

fixture opening, whereby the domed lens extends substantially beyond the fixture opening.

Regarding claims 6-7, Gardner al (particularly figure 5) as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 discloses the claimed invention except for a plurality of facets on a lens in order to refract light. O'Connell et al teaches a lens with a plurality of facets. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lens of Gardner al (particularly figure 5) to include facets as taught by O'Connell et al in order to efficiently diffuse and refract light to the surroundings.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Hume et al (particularly figure 5), Gardner al (particularly figure 5), Maruyama) in view of O'Connell et al as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 further in view of Schwaller et al. (Hume et al (particularly figure 5), Gardner al (particularly figure 5), Maruyama) in view of O'Connell et al as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of an elliptical reflector. Schwaller et al teaches a elliptical reflector 2. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the reflector of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5), Gardner al (particularly figure 5), Maruyama) to include a elliptical shape as taught by Schwaller et al in order to efficiently reflect light to the surroundings.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Hume et al (particularly figure 5), Gardner al (particularly figure 5), Maruyama or Kobayashi) in view of O'Connell et al as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 further in view of Leadford et al. (Hume et al (particularly figure 5), Gardner al (particularly figure 5), Maruyama or Kobayashi) in view of O'Connell et al as applied in claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11 discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of a partially metalized reflector surface or a reflective surface with facets. Leadford et al teaches a metal faceted reflector 18. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reflector of (Hume et al (particularly figure 5), Gardner al (particularly figure 5), Maruyama or Kobayashi) to include a faceted metalized reflective surface as taught by Leadford et al in order to efficiently reflect light to the surroundings

***Prior Art***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nakata teaches a domed lens and reflector lamp assembly similar to applicant's invention..

***Conclusion***


11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M. Sember whose telephone number is 571-272-2381. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 A.M- 5.30 p.m. first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 703-305-4939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thomas M Sember  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2875